REMARKS

Claims 1-25 and 44 remain pending with claims 1, 17, and 18 being independent.

The remainder of these remarks follow the Examiner comments in boxed text.

1. 1449 Filed October 18, 2004

Examiner's comments:

There are more than 150 references cited in the 1449 filed October 18, 2004. The Examiner would like to request Applicants' assistance to provide to the Examiner the relevance of each of the references with respect to the claims. See 37CFR 1.98 (a)(3)(i).

Applicants' remarks:

37 CFR 1.98(a)(3)(i) states:

> (3)(i) A concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in § 1.56 (c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent, publication, or other information listed that is not in the English language. The concise explanation may be either separate from applicant's specification or incorporated therein.

As the passage indicates, 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3)(i) applies only to information that "is not in the English language". Applicants are unaware of references submitted on the 1449 form that are not in the English language.

2. Claim 44

Examiner's comments:

Applicants are requested to identify the supports of newly submitted claim 44 in the drawings and the corresponding description in the specification.

Applicants' remarks:

Claim 44 recites:

> Claim 44. The method of claim 1 wherein the threads comprise threads provided by multiple programmable multi-threaded engines within a processor.

The drawings and specification provide support for claim 44 in a number of places. For example, page 4 of the application includes the following description of FIG. 1:

> functions. The hardware-based multi-threaded processor 12 includes multiple microengines 22, each with multiple hardware controlled program threads that can be simultaneously active and independently work on a task. In the embodiment shown, there are six microengines 22a-22f and each of the six microengines is capable of processing four program threads, as will be described more fully below.

FIG. 2 and its corresponding description describe an individual engine in greater detail.

3. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Examiner's comments:

> **Claims 1-25 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allison (USP 6,373,848) in view of Belkin (USP 6,604,125).**
>
> . . .
>
> **action that control logic 34 is for processing data. The request in Allison is taught in Figure 9 and demonstrated in Figure 1. In response to a request (the signal S which initiates the transfer shown in Figure 9), data is transferred from one of the ports (see ports 1-n in Figure 1) to RxFIFO for the control logic to process.**

Applicants' remarks:

Claim 1 recites:

> Claim 1 (previously amended): A method of receiving data from a network, comprising:
>
> issuing a request directing a transfer of data from one of a plurality of device ports to a storage unit and specifying a thread from among a plurality of processing program threads to process the data.

The Examiner has identified the signal **S** in FIG. 9 of Allison as providing the recited "request ... specifying a thread".

The **S** in FIG. 9 however is not a signal. The **S** in FIG. 9 is merely a conventional notation for the **S**tart of a flow-chart just as the **E** in FIG. 9 identifies the **E**nd of the flow-

chart. Further, the entire specification of Allison makes **no** mention of **S**, let alone that **S** represents a request that specifies a thread (or an instruction or logic or anything else). Further, the description relied on by the Examiner in column 11 does not describe the port selector as receiving **any** request whatsoever.

Examiner's comment

> ... **If Applicants disagree the teaching of such a request in Allison, Applicants are requested to identify the support of the request as recited in claim 1 in the specification.**

Applicants' remarks:

The application provides support for claim 1 in a variety of places. For example, on page 25, line 17, the specification states:

> ... the receive scheduler thread 92 writes a receive request by pushing data into the RCV_REQ FIFO 230 ...

The specification continues on page 28, line 12 with a description of the contents of a receive request pushed onto the RCV_REQ FIFO:

completion of the receive request. A TID field (bits 10:6) 230k specifies the receive thread to be notified or signaled after the receive request is processed. Therefore, if bit 11 is set, the RCV_REQ entry must be read twice, once by the receive thread and once by the receive scheduler thread, before it can be removed from the RCV_REQ FIFO. An RM field (bits 5:3) 230l specified the ID of the MAC device that has been selected by the receive scheduler. Lastly, an RP field (bits 2:0) 230m specifies which port of the MAC device specified in the RM field 230l has been selected.

In this example of a request, the receive request "TID" specifies the receive thread to be notified or signaled after the receive request is processed.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of the pending claims.

If any fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 referencing attorney docket number: 10559-137001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/16/05

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg No. 44, 133

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906